

BEFORE THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
POMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Reduction in Force of:

Certificated Employees of the Pomona
Unified School District,

Respondents.

OAH No. 2012030514

CORRECTED¹ PROPOSED DECISION

Ralph B. Dash, Administrative Law Judge with the Office of Administrative Hearings, heard this matter on April 11, 2012, at Pomona, California.

Howard A. Friedman and Martha I. Cassillas, Attorneys at Law, represented Pomona Unified School District (District).

Joshua Adams and Constance Hsiao, Attorneys at Law, represented 60 of the 79 Respondents named in Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof. Due notice of the time and place of hearing was given as required by law. There was no appearance by or on behalf of those Respondents listed on Exhibit A whose names are marked with an asterisk, and the matter proceeded by way of default hearing as to them.

Oral and documentary evidence having been received and the matter having been submitted, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following Finding of Facts.

1. Richard Martinez, Superintendent of the District, acting in his official capacity, caused all pleadings, notices and other papers to be filed and served upon Respondents pursuant to the provisions of Education Code² sections 44949 and 44955. All pre-hearing jurisdictional requirements have been met with respect to the District and all Respondents.³

¹ This Proposed Decision is issued to correct a typographical error in the Proposed Decision dated April 25, 2012.

² Except as otherwise noted, all statutory references are to the Education Code.

³ One Respondent made a jurisdictional challenge based on alleged lack of notice. That issue is more fully set forth in Finding 11.

2. On February 28, 2012, the District's Governing Board adopted a Resolution to reduce and discontinue the services of 90.6 full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated positions at the close of the 2011-2012 school year, as follows:

After School Education & Safety Teacher.....	7.0
High School Counselor.....	5.0
School Nurse	3.6
Teacher-Adult School-Career Technical Education (Auto Mechanics)	1.0
Teacher-Elementary.....	40.0
Teacher-Elementary-Physical Education.....	8.0
Teacher-Secondary-English.....	4.0
Teacher-Secondary-Foreign Language (Spanish).....	2.0
Teacher-Secondary-Health.....	2.0
Teacher-Secondary-Math.....	4.0
Teacher-Secondary-Life Science.....	2.0
Teacher-Secondary-Physical Education.....	4.0
Teacher-Secondary-Physical Science.....	2.0
Teacher-Secondary-Social Science.....	4.0
Teacher-Secondary-Technology Proficiency.....	2.0

3. On March 13, 2012, the District's Governing Board adopted a Resolution to reduce and discontinue the services of an additional 30 FTE certificated positions at the close of the 2011-2102 school year, as follows:

Teacher – Adult School – Adult Basic Education/ High School Diploma/GED.....	4
Teacher – Adult School – English as a Second Language.....	10
Teacher – Adult School – CTE – Barbering.....	1
Teacher – Adult School – CTE - Certified Nursing Assistant.....	2
Teacher – Adult School – CTE – Cosmetology.....	4
Teacher – Adult School – CTE – Machinist.....	1
Teacher – Adult School – CTE - Medical Assistant.....	1
Teacher – Adult School – CTE - Medical Billing & Coding.....	1
Teacher – Adult School – CTE - Office Technician.....	2
Teacher – Adult School – CTE - Pharmacy Technician.....	1
Teacher – Adult School – Parent Education.....	1
Teacher – Adult School – Teacher Specialist.....	1
Teacher – Adult School – CTE – Welding.....	1

TOTAL FTE Reduced or Discontinued under both Resolutions..... 120.6

4. These services are “particular kinds of services” that may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955. The Board’s decision to reduce or discontinue these particular kinds of services was not arbitrary or capricious, but constituted a proper exercise of discretion.

5. The reduction or discontinuation of these particular kinds of services related to the welfare of the District and its pupils. The reduction or discontinuation of particular kinds of services was necessary to decrease the number of certificated employees of the District as determined by the Board.

6. The Board properly considered all known attrition, resignations, retirements, deaths and requests for transfer in determining the actual number of necessary layoff notices to be delivered to its employees as of March 15, 2010. (*San Jose Teachers Association v. Allen* (1983) 144 Cal.App.3d 627 at 636 (1983)).⁴

7. In its Resolutions, the Board directed the Superintendent or his designee to serve notices of termination in accordance with and in the manner prescribed by Education Code sections 44949 and 44955.

8. The Board also adopted criteria to be used in determining the order of termination of certificated employees who first rendered paid service to the District in a probationary position on the same date. The Board resolved that the order of termination of said employees shall be determined by reference to certain tiebreaker criteria and to points assigned to each category of tiebreaker criteria. The Board determined that such criteria best serve the needs of the District and its students.

9. On March 5, 2012, pursuant to the Resolutions described in Findings 2 and 3 and the provisions of sections 44949 and 44955, the Superintendent gave written notice to Respondents that he had recommended to the Board that notice be given to Respondents that their services will not be required for the 2012-2013 school year. Respondents requested a hearing to determine if there is cause for not employing them for the ensuing school year.

10. On March 27, 2011, the District filed and timely served an Accusation, copies of the Resolutions, a Statement to Respondent, a blank Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and pertinent sections of the Government and Education Codes upon Respondents, who filed timely Notices of Defense.

11. Respondent Albert Raymond Esparza, through his counsel, made an offer of proof that he did not receive the March 5, 2012 notice and that the notice should be rescinded as to him. Darren Knowles, Interim Administrative Director of Personnel Services for the

⁴ All layoffs were for particular kinds of service, and not “average daily attendance” which might have required positively assured attrition to be considered through May 15, 2012.

District, testified that all respondents were served with layoff notices by certified mail with return receipt requested. The District offered Exhibit 8, a copy of a “proof of mailing” from the United States Postal Service, showing that the notice to Mr. Esparza was served, by certified mail, at Mr. Esparza’s address of record with the District. Accordingly, his motion to rescind the notice is denied.

12. During the hearing, the District rescinded the layoff notices issued to Respondents Paula Vega, Mary Lea Johnson-DeJohn, Patrick Trejo and Carmen Amancio. In addition, the District made adjustments to its seniority list which including ranking Rosemary Antillon immediately ahead of Matthew Russo instead of immediately behind him, and changed the seniority date of Grace Jauregui from August 29, 2007 to September 5, 2006. The District also amended its Bumping List (Exhibit 4) to show that Respondents Debra Anaya, Danielle Baker, Karena Owen, Elvira Baeza, Monica Medina-Jimenez, Amanda Romo, Veronica McKelvey, Jamie Beckel, Lisa Lopez, and Philip Hererra are all eligible to bump into the After School Education and Safety (ASES) program.⁵

13. School districts have broad discretion in defining positions within the district and establishing requirements for employment. (*Martin v. Kentfield School Dist.* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 294, 299-300.) Similarly, school districts have the discretion to determine particular kinds of services that will be eliminated, “even though a service continues to be performed or provided in a different manner by the district.” (*Gallup v. Board of Trustees* (1996) 41 Cal.App.4th 1571, 1582-1585; *Hildebrandt v. St. Helena Unified School Dist.* (2009) 172 Cal.App.4th 334, 343.)

14. What amounts to a particular kind of service for lay-off purposes varies according to the circumstances, and must in each case be determined in the light of the particular facts. A particular kind of service may be a certain subject, it may be the teaching of the subject for a particular purpose, or it may be a particular manner of teaching the subject. (*Walsh v. Board of Trustees of Redlands High School Dist.*, (1934) 2 Cal. App. 2d 180, *Fuller v. Berkeley School Dist. of Alameda County*, (1934) 2 Cal.2d 152; *Gallup v. Board of Trustees*, (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1571.) *CTA vs. Goleta Union School District* (1982) 132 Cal.App.3d 32, holds that elementary teaching is a distinct particular kind of service. In *Gallup*, the court specifically noted that the issue is not *who* will perform the services, but *how* the services will be performed. (*Gallup, supra* at 1588.)

15. In order to justify skipping a junior employee in a reduction in force, a District must demonstrate a specific need for personnel with special training and experience to teach a specific course of study or to provide certain services, and that the more senior employee does not possess those skills. (Ed. Code § 44955, subd. (d).).

⁵ Because teachers in the ASES program are paid at a different rate than classroom teachers, the District will treat these teachers as if they had “39-month rights.” Under Education Code § 44931, teachers who are permanent upon their resignation have the right of re-hire for 39 months and will be restored to all the rights and benefits of a permanent employee upon return.

16. Appellate court decisions in the layoff context have held that where competency is not demonstrated by a senior employee, a junior employee having the ability to serve the needs of a program may be retained by the school district even though it may result in the senior employee's termination. (*Brough v. El Segundo Unified Sch. Dist.* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 702, citing *Moreland Teachers Ass'n v. Kurze* (1980) 109 Cal.App.3d 648, 655.) Courts have reasoned that the law requires “that someone make informed determinations whether a laid-off employee . . . is both 'certificated and competent,'” and that “these determinations necessarily involve ‘discretionary decisions’ by a school district's responsible officials because they ‘have a special competence’ to make them.” (*King v. Berkeley Unified Sch. Dist.*, (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 1016, 1023; *Duax v. Kern Community College Dist.*, (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 555, 565). In making this determination, a school district must consider not only legal qualifications (i.e., whether a teacher is appropriately credentialed) but also actual competence, or “the correlation between the applicant's specific training and experience and the duties of the available position.” (*King, supra*, 89 Cal.App.3d at 1019.)

17. In *Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School*, 170 Cal.App.4th 127 at 131, a senior English and social science teacher challenged the retention of two junior teachers teaching in a community day school, stating that the junior teachers were improperly skipped because the senior teacher was certificated and competent to render the services they were providing. The teacher argued that only formal, written program requirements are relevant in determining the District's needs and the teacher's competence to fill these needs. (*Id.* at 138.) The court rejected the teacher's argument, finding instead that subdivision (d)(1) of section 44955 “expressly allows a district to demonstrate its specific ‘needs’ and there is nothing in the statute that requires such needs to be evidenced by formal, written policies, course or job descriptions, or program requirements.” (*Ibid.*) The court went on to specifically find that while the teacher may have the base qualifications necessary to be certificated and competent because she held the appropriate credential to teach in the community day school, “subdivision (d)(1) recognizes a district may have specific needs for personnel to teach a specific course of study that go beyond base qualifications.” (*Ibid.*)

Nurse Reardon

18. Pamela Reardon is a school nurse and has a seniority date of September 4, 2001. She is credentialed to provide school nurse services and is licensed by the California Board of Registered Nursing as a registered nurse. Her current assignment is as a school nurse, rendering aid at the school site. Ms. Reardon received a layoff notice while Rosalyn Benson, also credentialed to provide school nurse services, and who has a seniority date of October 17, 2011, did not receive a layoff notice. Ms. Benson is currently assigned to the Health Services department which has a clinic to render health related services to families. This is not a typical “school nurse” position where services to students are rendered at the school site. In addition to being licensed by the California Board of Registered Nursing as a registered nurse, Ms. Benson is also licensed as a Nurse Practitioner (NP) and as a Nurse Practitioner Furnisher (NPF) while Ms. Reardon is not so licensed. An NP is permitted to

render significantly more advanced medical services than a registered nurse. According to the Nursing Board's website (www.rn.ca.gov, of which official notice is taken) an NP "is a registered nurse who possesses additional preparation and skills in physical diagnosis, psycho-social assessment, and management of health-illness needs in primary health care, who has been prepared in a program that conforms to Board standards as specified in California Code of Regulations, CCR, 1484 Standards of Education. . . . This means that, in some cases, the NP will be the only health professional to see the patient and, in the process, will employ a combination of nursing and medical functions approved by standardized procedures." Also according to the Nursing Board website, an NPF, under Business and Professions Code section 2836.1, is authorized "to obtain and utilize a 'furnishing number' to furnish drugs and devices. Furnishing or ordering drugs and devices by the nurse practitioner is defined to mean the act of making a pharmaceutical agent or agents available to the patient in strict accordance with a standardized procedure." In other words, NPF's may write drug prescriptions. Accordingly, Ms. Benson possesses far more advanced training and certification to render services at a health clinic than does Ms. Reardon and the District was justified in skipping the junior employee (Ms. Benson) and laying off the more senior employee (Ms. Reardon).⁶

19. In the alternative, Ms. Reardon argues that Ms. Miller can be shifted into the position of school nurse practitioner, and Ms. Reardon can bump into Ms. Miller's current position of school nurse. However, the District is not obligated to force a more senior certificated employee into another position to accommodate a junior certificated employee. Section 44955 does not authorize or require the forced reassignment of a senior employee, not subject to layoff, in order to accommodate a junior employee who is faced with termination. (*Duax vs. Kern Community College District* (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 555, 568-569.) In *Duax*, the court expressly rejected the concept of so-called "inverse bumping." In doing so it specifically noted that a statute pertaining to community college layoffs, with language identical to section 44955, subdivision (c), did not include an obligation to make assignments based on the notion of inverse bumping. Further, a district has no obligation to transfer an employee to prevent the layoff of another employee even if the initial certificated employee requests that he or she be transferred. Indeed, Education Code section 35035 states the superintendent of a school district, subject to the approval of the governing board, has the authority to "assign all employees of the district employed in positions requiring certification qualifications, to the positions in which they are to serve." The statute contains no language limiting this right in any circumstances, including layoffs. The statute gives the superintendent broad power in this area. For example, a superintendent has the power to transfer certificated teachers from one school site to another simply because doing so would be in the "best interest of the district." (See *California Teachers' Assn. v. Governing Bd.*

⁶ At the hearing, Ms. Reardon testified that "she could perform the same duties" as Suzanne Miller (seniority date March 20, 1978) who is also an NP and an NPF, but who spends 90 percent of her time as a school nurse, not as a health clinic nurse. While Ms. Reardon may very well be able to render the same services as Ms. Miller (and by analogy, Ms. Benson) in a school setting, she cannot render the same services as Ms. Miller or Ms. Benson in a clinic setting.

(1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 606, 614-615; *Centinela Valley Secondary Teachers Assn.* (1974) 37 Cal.App.3d 35, 40.) Section 44955 does not require the District to reassign Ms. Miller, a more senior employee, to accommodate Respondent Ms. Reardon, a junior employee. Section 44955, subdivision (b), only requires that “the services of no permanent employee may be terminated under the provisions of this section while any probationary employee, or any other employee with less seniority, is retained to render a service which said permanent employee is certificated and competent to render.” Consistent with that code section, no employee junior to Ms. Reardon was retained to render the service Ms. Reardon is certificated and competent to render.

Psychologist Diaz

20. The February 28, 2012 resolution calls for the reduction of 7.0 FTE for ASES teachers. Jennifer Diaz was hired as an ASES teacher and has a seniority date of August 29, 2007. Ms. Diaz has also recently completed her studies, earned her degree, and now has a clear pupil personnel services (PPS) school psychologist credential. Ms. Diaz argues that she should bump into the position of school psychologist because she is more senior than current school psychologist Zarji Wurshum who has a seniority date of October 29, 2007. Section 44955 generally prohibits the layoff of any permanent employee where another employee with less seniority is retained to render a service which the permanent employee is certificated and competent to render. (Cal. Educ. Code § 44955, subd. (b).) Notwithstanding, school districts may retain less senior personnel if the school district “demonstrates a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study . . . and that the certificated employee has special training and experience necessary to teach that course or course of study or to provide those services, which others with more seniority do not possess.” (Cal. Educ. Code § 44955, subd. (d)(1).)

21. California courts have held that where competency is not demonstrated by a senior employee, a junior employee having the ability to serve the needs of a program may be retained by the school district even though it may result in the senior employee’s termination. (*Brough v. El Segundo Unified Sch. Dist.* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 702, 714-15, citing *Moreland Teachers Ass’n v. Kurze* (1980) 109 Cal.App.3d 648, 655.) The law requires “that someone make informed determinations whether a laid-off employee . . . is both ‘certificated and competent,’” and that “these determinations necessarily involve ‘discretionary decisions’ by a school district’s responsible officials because they ‘have a special competence’ to make them.” (*King v. Berkeley Unified Sch. Dist.* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 1016, 1023; *Duax*, 196 Cal.App.3d 555 at 569.) A school district must consider not only legal qualifications (i.e., whether a teacher is appropriately certified), but also actual competence, meaning “the correlation between the applicant’s specific training and experience and the duties of the available position.” (*King*, 89 Cal.App.3d at 1019.)

22. Ms. Wurshum has specialized training and experience that justifies skipping her in favor of laying off Ms. Diaz. Specifically, Ms. Wurshum not only has received nonviolent crisis intervention (NCI) certification, she conducts training sessions for the NCI program. Also, the District has a positive behavior support (PBS) program (a method of

dealing with difficult special needs children in the classroom), which requires training in the “Boys Town Curriculum.”⁷ Ms. Wurshum has obtained training in the Boys Town Curriculum which is specific to conducting the PBS program. Boys Town Curriculum training cannot be obtained online and such training is not provided every year. Of the 25 school psychologists in the District, only four psychologists have the Boys Town Curriculum training. Although it is only five days long, the training is important to have in the PBS program. Under District policy, only a Boys Town trained psychologist (or supervisor) may act as a substitute for another Boys Town trained psychologist. In addition, while Ms. Wurshum has been a practicing school psychologist for the last five years, Ms. Diaz only recently received her full PPS, in or about May 2011. Ms. Diaz has never before worked as a school psychologist. She does not have the special training and experience necessary to provide those services that Ms. Wurshum can provide as a school psychologist. Here, just like in *Bledsoe, supra*, there is a specific need to retain Ms. Wurshum, who has specific training that enables her to implement and engage in the PBS program for the benefit of the students in the District that Ms. Diaz does not possess.

//

⁷ According to the Boys Town website (<http://www.boystown.org/educators/>):

The Boys Town Education ModelSM is a school-based intervention strategy that focuses on managing behavior, building relationships, and teaching social skills. It emphasizes preventive and proactive practices rather than reactive responses to deal with student behavior. The Boys Town Education ModelSM puts Boys Town’s research-proven child-care methods to work in a variety of educational settings. It gives classroom teachers, administrators and support staff the tools to implement key Model components:

A curriculum of specific life skills taught as expectations in the classroom

Teaching methods that support the life skills curriculum – specific ways to teach the life skills to students

Administrative intervention – a method for dealing with students who are referred to the office from the classroom because of disruptive behavior

Focus on student competencies – creating a positive classroom environment by encouraging teachers to see the value of developing a positive relationship with each student and praising students’ positive behaviors and successes

These components are part of a complete system-wide approach to creating and encouraging respectful staff-student relationships by changing the way schools address student behavior.

Conclusions of Law

1. Jurisdiction for these proceedings exists pursuant to sections 44949 and 44955.
2. The services set forth in Findings 2 and 3 are particular kinds of service which may be reduced or discontinued in accordance with applicable statutes and case law. A district may reduce services, within the meaning of Education Code Section 44955, subdivision (b), "either by determining that a certain type of service to students shall not, thereafter, be performed at all by anyone, or it may 'reduce services' by determining that proffered services shall be reduced in extent because fewer employees are made available to deal with the pupils involved." (*Rutherford v. Board of Trustees* (1976) 64 Cal.App.3d 167, 178-179.)
3. Cause exists because of the reduction in particular kinds of services to reduce the District's teaching positions as set forth in the Board resolutions and to give notice to the affected teachers pursuant to Education Code section 44955. (*Campbell v. Abbot* (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 796; *Degener v. Governing Board* (1977) 67 Cal.App.3d 689.)
4. The District's decision to reduce or discontinue the services is neither arbitrary nor capricious, but rather a proper exercise of the District's discretion.
5. No junior certificated employee is scheduled to be retained to perform services which a more senior employee is certificated and competent to render.

ORDER

1. As a result of the reductions of services, the District may give notice to all teachers listed on Exhibit A that their services will not be required for the 2012/2013 school year; provided, however, the District shall not send such notice to Paula Vega, Mary Lea Johnson-DeJohn, Patrick Trejo and Carmen Amancio; and, provided further, that the District shall give notice to Debra Anaya, Danielle Baker, Karena Owen, Elvira Baeza, Monica Medina-Jimenez, Amanda Romo, Veronica McKelvey, Jamie Beckel, Lisa Lopez, and Philip Herrera that they will be retained for the 2012/2013 school year and reassigned to the ASES program.
2. The District shall amend its seniority list to change the seniority date of Grace Jauregui from August 29, 2007 to September 5, 2006 and to rank Rosemary Antillon immediately ahead of Matthew Russo instead of immediately behind him.

Dated: _____

RALPH B. DASH
Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings
EXHIBIT A

1	*ALVAREZ, MELANIE MARIE	FREMONT
2	ALVAREZ, SHIRLEY	Adult Education
3	AMANCIO, CARMEN	SAN ANTONIO
4	*ANAYA, DEBRA	RANCH HILLS
5	*ANTILLON, ROSEMARY	GAREY
6	AYALA, GINA CALLERO	EMERSON
7	BAEZA, ELVIRA H.	DECKER
8	BALDRICHE, DARIEN	INSTRUCTIONAL SVS
9	BARKER, MATTHEW K.	EMERSON
10	BARRIENTOS, CLAUDIA M	MADISON
11	*BAUTISTA, KARMEN (LOA)	Adult Education
12	BEARDEN, CAROLINE M.	SAN JOSE
13	BECKEL, JAMIE ERINA	ARROYO
14	*CABRAL, ELSA ROSAURA	PHILADELPHIA
15	CADDICK, CAROLE M	Adult Education
16	CARR, LACEY M.	MARSHALL
17	CARRASCO-GONZALEZ, CYNTHIA C.	HEALTH SVS.
18	*CASTILLO, KATHY A.	LINCOLN
19	CHAPMAN, MARGARET H	Adult Education
20	CORDOVA, VERONICA	KINGSLEY
21	*DIAZ, GABRIELA	PHILADELPHIA
22	DIAZ, JENNIFER M.	WESTMONT
23	DIAZ, SUZANNE	Adult Education
24	EDU, GLORY IBUM	ARROYO
25	*FASTING, LILIANA P.	GAREY
26	FITZSIMMONS, KIMBERLY M	KELLOGG
27	FLORES, MARGARITA GARCIA	FREMONT
28	*GEORGE, OLABESI L	Adult Education
29	GOSS, JEANETTE G.	EMERSON
30	HARDIN, AL	Adult Education
31	HERRERA, PHILIP JESUS	SAN JOSE
32	HUDSON, LEONARD R.	GAREY
33	JAUREQUI, GRACE A	Adult Education
34	JOHNSON-DEJOHN, MARY LEA	DIAMOND RANCH
35	*LEE, LEISHA M.	INSTRUCTIONAL SVS
36	LONG, COLBY R.	INSTRUCTIONAL SVS
37	*MAINE, SHAUNA	Adult Education
38	MARABLE, KELSEY ANN	VEJAR

39	*MARTINEZ, JOSE	Adult Education
40	MC KELVEY, VERONICA	WASHINGTON
41	MCFADDEN, JUDY	Adult Education
42	MONTOYA, LIZETH	LOPEZ
43	MORALES, CYNTHIA	ALCOTT
44	MORRIS, EVAN SEAN	EMERSON
45	NAKATA, SUSAN H.	HEALTH SVS.
46	*NILO, TERESITA	Adult Education
47	OJEDA, CELIA	MADISON
48	OLAIZ, RALPH S.	LOPEZ
49	OLESCYSKI, ROSALINDA	INSTRUCTIONAL SVS
50	ORTIZ, LANI M	SAN ANTONIO
51	PALOMERA, LETICIA J.	ROOSEVELT
52	PAYNE, PAMELA SUE	ALLISON
53	*PEREZ, JUDITH N.	PHILADELPHIA
54	PORRAS, ELIZA M	Adult Education
55	RAMIREZ, LAURA PATRICIA	DECKER
56	REARDON, PAMELA P.	HEALTH SVS.
57	*RIGONAN, ERIC CHRISTOPHER S	INSTRUCTIONAL SVS
58	*RIVERA, CARMEN	Adult Education
59	ROMERO, LESLEY ANN	DIAMOND POINT
60	ROMO, AMANDA	ALCOTT
61	SANCHEZ, MARIA DEL CARMEN	PUEBLO
62	SANDOVAL, LAURA LILIA	ALCOTT
63	SHARMA, VIBHUTI	MONTVUE
64	*SMITH, DEANNA KYUNG HE	CORTEZ
65	SMOTHERMON, MEGAN THERESE	FREMONT
66	STONE, ROBIN S.	DECKER
67	SYLVIA, JENNY M	CORTEZ
68	TISSERA, KAMALINI	Adult Education
69	TOLAND, SANDY NGO	MONTVUE
70	TREJO, PATRICK A.	LORBEER
71	*UFKES, MAUREEN	Adult Education
72	VALDEZ, OSCAR	EMERSON
73	VEGA, MARGARITO	Adult Education
74	*VEGA, PAULA A.	PALOMARES
75	*VELARDE, MARGARET	Adult Education
76	VILLANUEVA, ANGELICA	ROOSEVELT
77	WARBURTON, SARAH E.	DECKER
78	WINNER, NACIRA	Adult Education
79	WINTRODE, JENNIFER A.	ROOSEVELT

